REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 29-37 were pending. Applicants amend Claims 1, 8, and 29 with the present amendment. Therefore, Claims 1-15 and 29-37 remain pending for consideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-15 and 29-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,652,556 to Van Tassel, et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection; however, to expedite prosecution, Claims 1, 8, and 29 have been amended. Applicants reserve the right to pursue previous versions of the amended claims and to further argue the rejection in future applications.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, a device for containing emboli within a left atrial appendage of a patient, comprising . . . a frame . . . ; and a slider assembly coupled to the distal hub of the frame . . .wherein movement of the nut relative to the guide tube is at least partially limited by interference between a portion of the nut and a portion of the guide tube, and wherein movement of the nut relative to the guide tube does not affect the device's shape.

Van Tassel fails to teach or suggest, inter alia, a slider assembly wherein movement of a nut relative to a guide tube is at least partially limited by interference between a portion of the nut and a portion of the guide tube, and wherein movement of the nut relative to the guide tube does not affect the device's shape.

In contrast, Van Tassel teaches rotation of a driver 958 with respect to a threaded member 948 to deploy an implantable device. For example, referring to Figure 90, Van Tassel explains (emphasis added):

> To deploy the attachment apparatus 912, the male threaded member 948 is rotated to cause the female threaded member 952 to move proximally, *thereby deflecting the longitudinal struts 946 radially outwardly* (as indicated by arrow 966). Further rotation of the male threaded member 948 deflects the longitudinal struts 946 radially outwardly until they engage the ostium 20 or the interior wall of the atrial appendage 13.

See Van Tassel, column 26, lines 43-50. Van Tassel's teaches rotation of a male threaded member with respect to a female threaded member for the purpose of deflecting longitudinal struts radially outwardly, thereby changing the implanted device's shape.

Furthermore, it would not be obvious to provide a slider assembly wherein movement of the nut relative to the guide tube does not affect the device's shape. Therefore, Van Tassel fails to teach or suggest all of the claim language, and Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Van Tassel.

Claims 2-7 depend from Claim 1 and therefore distinguish over the applied art for at least the same reasons. In addition, Claims 2-7 distinguish over the applied art for the unique combinations of features recited in those claims.

Claim 8 recites, inter alia, an implant adapted to be positioned within an opening inside the body of a patient, the implant comprising: a frame . . . ; and a slider assembly . . . , the slider assembly comprising a receiving portion adapted to releasably engage a delivery device, the receiving portion being moveable relative to the frame to allow limited motion of the delivery device without substantially affecting the shape or position of the implant . . . .

Van Tassel fails to teach or suggest, inter alia, a slider assembly having a receiving portion being moveable relative to the frame to allow limited motion of the delivery device without substantially affecting the shape or position of an implant. Furthermore, it would not be obvious to provide such a slider assembly. Therefore, Claim 8 distinguishes over the applied art.

Claims 9-15 depend from Claim 8 and therefore distinguish over the applied art for at least the same reasons. In addition, Claims 9-15 distinguish over the applied art for the unique combinations of features recited in those claims.

Claim 29 has been amended to recite, inter alia, a system for preventing the release of embolic material from the left atrial appendage of a medical patient, comprising: an axially moveable core . . . ; an implant . . . ; and a slider assembly positioned within the implant, the slider assembly comprising: a guide tube . . . ; and a nut . . . ; wherein movement of the axially moveable core when engaged with the nut allows the nut to slide within the guide tube without substantially affecting the shape or position of the implant.

Van Tassel fails to teach or suggest, inter alia, a slider assembly wherein movement of an axially moveable core when engaged with a nut allows the nut to slide within the guide tube without substantially affecting the shape or position of the implant. Furthermore, it would not be obvious to provide such a slider assembly. Therefore, Claim 29 distinguishes over the applied art.

Claims 30-37 depend from Claim 29 and therefore distinguish over the applied art for at least the same reasons. In addition, Claims 30-37 distinguish over the applied art for the unique combinations of features recited in those claims.

The amendments to Claims 1, 8, and 29 do not introduce any new matter. For example, support for the claim amendments appears, inter alia, at paragraphs 163-165 of the above-captioned application, as published.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain or require further clarification the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' counsel at the number indicated below in order to resolve such issues promptly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: March 26, 2007

By: 

Andrew I. Kimmel
Registration No. 58,855
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

3548285
031907